Message

From: Susan Griffin [Griffin.SusanLNDU@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]

Sent: 2/4/2011 5:54:08 PM

To: Schmidt, Andrew [Schmidt.Andrew@epa.gov]

CC: Wharton, Steve [Wharton.Steve@epa.gov]; Deborah McKean [McKean.Deborah@epa.gov]

Subject: Re: VB I-70 OU2 SRC Risk Assessment

It had total and dissolved concentrations in groundwater and we considered only the probability of direct ingestion of groundwater. According to the risk assessment it was highly unlikely that people would use the groundwater as a drinking water source. Therefore the risk from ingestion of groundwater was not quantitated. The risk assessment did not look at the potential for soil leaching to groundwater.

-----Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Susan Griffin/R8/USEPA/US@EPA From: Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US

Date: 02/03/2011 04:43PM

Cc: Steve Wharton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Deborah McKean/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: VB I-70 OU2 SRC Risk Assessment

Hi Susan,

Steve wanted me to ask a clarification question (Steve, if I phrase this poorly, please do not hesitate to correct me), did the risk assessment look at actual dissolved phase groundwater concentrations and dismiss the pathway, and/or did the risk assessment look at the potential for impacted soils leaching to groundwater and then dismiss the pathway?

Thank you!

Andrew

Andrew P. Schmidt, P.G.
Regional Superfund Hydrogeologist
US EPA Region 8, 8EPR-PS
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129
303.312.6283 (office)
303.312.7151 (fax)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Susan Griffin---02/03/2011 11:19:48 AM---Hi Andrew, 1. Site-specific exposures for current and future commercial workers, construction worke

From: Susan Griffin/R8/USEPA/US

To: Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Deborah McKean/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Sam Garcia/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Steve

Wharton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/03/2011 11:19 AM

Subject: Re: VB I-70 OU2 SRC Risk Assessment

Hi Andrew,

1. Site-specific exposures for current and future commercial workers, construction workers, recreational visitors, and future residential receptors were estimated from the concentration of contaminants in

- soil. These site specific exposures were compared to both cancer and non-cancer toxicity values (typically obtained from EPA's IRIS database) to derive site-specific estimates of risk.
- 2. The OU2 risk assessment did not evaluate ingestion of groundwater as a complete pathway. The OU3 risk assessment did. In the OU3 assessment, the measured concentrations in groundwater were used to derive site-specific estimates of exposure via direct ingestion for hypothetical commercial workers, construction workers and residents. These site-specific exposures were compared to both cancer and non-cancer toxicity values to derive site-specific estimates of risk.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Susan

Andrew Schmidt---02/03/2011 11:07:52 AM---Hi Susan, I was just in a meeting this morning regarding VB I-70 OU2. A few questions about the ris

From: Andrew Schmidt/R8/USEPA/US
To: Susan Griffin/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Deborah McKean/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Steve Wharton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Sam

Garcia/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/03/2011 11:07 AM

Subject: VB I-70 OU2 SRC Risk Assessment

Hi Susan,

I was just in a meeting this morning regarding VB I-70 OU2. A few questions about the risk assessment were raised during the meeting, and it was requested that I pass the questions on to you. The questions are below. Let me know if you might be able to help, and if not, perhaps where else we should look.

- 1. What risk-based values were used for comparison against site-specific concentrations of COCs in soil during the risk assessment?
- 2. Was there an analysis of the leaching to groundwater pathway? If so, what values were used for the leaching to groundwater comparison?

Thank you, and please don't hesitate to contact me with any clarification questions!

Andrew

Andrew P. Schmidt, P.G.
Regional Superfund Hydrogeologist
US EPA Region 8, 8EPR-PS
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129
303.312.6283 (office)
303.312.7151 (fax)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.